

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:
John C. Harvey *et al.*

Application No.: 08/397,636

Filed: March 2, 1995

For: **SIGNAL PROCESSING APPARATUS AND
METHODS**

Confirmation No.: 6228

Art Unit: 2628

Examiner: Peter-Anthony Pappas

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Pursuant to item 4 on page 2 of the July 7, 2010 Notice of Allowance in the above captioned application, Applicants hereby submit the following Examiner interview summaries that are relevant to the allowance of this application.

SUMMARY OF INTERVIEWS

MAY 4, 2009

The prosecution of this application, along with all but two of Applicants' copending application, was suspended for several years pending the outcome of the appeal of Application Serial Nos. 08/470,571 and 08/487,526 and the reexamination proceedings of seven related patents. Applicants inquired into the status of these applications in January, 2009, as the current six-month suspension period expired. Applicants requested that the suspension of these applications not be renewed. The Office, through Supervisory Examiner David L. Ometz indicated that the suspensions would not be renewed and that prosecution would recommence.

Applicants wish to thank Examiner David L. Ometz for the courtesy of the interview held on May 4, 2009 in which Applicants' representatives and the Examiners discussed an overall plan for examination of the remaining 110 applications which relate to this application and have a common chain of priority. Applicants were informed that the Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) was developing a plan to resume examination and that Applicants would be informed when the plan was in place.

JULY 22, 2009

Applicants were informed in July, 2009, that a team of examiners had been assembled to examine Applicants' copending applications. Applicants appreciate the courtesies extended to Applicants' Representatives in a meeting held July 22, 2009, with the examination team. In attendance at the meeting were Thomas J. Scott, Jr. and Carl L. Benson, of Goodwin Procter and the PTO personnel identified on the attached list. Applicants' representatives made a presentation to the Examiners in attendance in accordance with the attached agenda and provided the materials attached hereto to the Examiners for their consideration and use in the further examination of this application and the other application related to this application as identified in Tab 2 of the materials provided to the Examiners in the meeting. Applicants' representatives agreed to respond to any telephone inquiries or to be present for personal interview at the PTO in any circumstance where the Examiner believed such an interview would advance the prosecution of this application.

MAY-JUNE, 2010

During May and June of 2010, the Examiner and Applicant conducted telephone interviews to discuss the above-referenced application. The Applicant provided a proposed amendment to the Examiner, and the Examiner and Applicants then exchanged revisions of the proposed amendments to correct several informalities, eventually coming to an agreement as to the allowable claims. The Examiner cited U.S. Patents 4,025,851 (to Haselwood *et al.*) and 4,054,911 (to Fletcher *et al.*) as particularly relevant. These claims as agreed upon are entered by Examiner's amendment with the Notice of Allowance.

CONCLUSION

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's time and consideration in this matter.

Dated: July 19, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By Thomas J. Scott, Jr./

Thomas J. Scott, Jr.

Registration No.: 27,836

GOODWIN PROCTER LLP

901 New York Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20001

(202) 346-4000

Attorney for Applicants